

000

Since unified Germany has assumed a predominant position in the center of Europe, the fate of the Slavic race has become inseparably bound up with our own. If this race succeeds in holding in check German expansion towards the east and towards the south, that is to say towards the Mediterranean, we may hope to maintain our position in the Vosges area and, who knows, perhaps re-establish it upon the Rhine. If it ultimately goes under in the struggle, the future of the French nation becomes irremediably jeopardized.

The Franco-Russian alliance has been the natural result of a state of affairs whose gravity has not been suspected for far too long a time by our statesmen.

But the Russians are not the only representatives of this Slavic race, which extends from the Pacific Ocean to the Adriatic. Besides the Poles, enjoying a popularity among us for so long, which, however, has been fatal to them as it encouraged them to engage in fruitless struggles, there is a whole /ii/ series of peoples which spread from the Carpathians to the Adriatic; they have hardly any reason to be satisfied with their present lot. These peoples have to fight not only against German ambitions; they must also stand against those of the Magyars, of the Greeks, of the Turks. And we have the greatest interest in knowing what strength they possess, what may be their future chances of success.

114

Among the innumerable publications of which they have been the subject in recent years, there is none which affords as serious a scientific interest as the one whose translation is herewith presented. It is the result of a study pursued for many years without intermission by a scholar of the first rank.

The author belongs to that nation, the Czech, which stands in the forefront of the Slavic peoples and which has given to science so many remarkable men. Upon many occasions I have had the opportunity of calling the attention of my countrymen to these men. (1)

1. See especially my studies on the historian Frantisek Palacky /iii/ (*Etudes slaves*, Volume II); on the poet Kollar (*Russes et Slaves*, Volume I); on Václav Hanka (*Journal des Savants*, 1907); on Václav Tomek (*ibid.*, 1908); on Ladislav Rieger (*Correspondant*, 1909); on Šafarik (*Journal des Savants*, 1910); Paris et Prague (*Nouvelle Revue*, 1908); and my monograph, Prague (*Collection des Villes d'art*).

● 114

Son of a distinguished Hellenist, whose early death was a loss to science and education, Mr. Lubor Niederle was born at Klatovy in 1865. At a very early age he became interested in anthropological studies. As this branch of /iii/ science was in no wise represented at the University of Prague, he went to study it at Munich and at Paris. After having visited the principal museums of the Occident, he went to Russia and from 1893 on he devoted himself particularly to Slavic ethnography, archaeology, and anthropology. He assisted in the foundation of a review entitled *Le Peuple tchèque* which began to appear in 1891, and which is at present directed by his eminent colleague Mr. Zibrt. Mr. Niederle was one of the organizers of the Czechoslovakia ethnographical exposition which was held at Prague in 1895. I had the good fortune to visit this very interesting exposition, an account of which may be found in one of my books. (1)

1. Russes et Slaves (Volume III, p. 340-357, Librairie Hachette, 1896) On the Ethnographic Museum, see Chapter II of Prague.

The collections gathered together for this exposition became the foundation for an ethnographic museum of which Mr. Niederle was the first curator and which, after being temporarily sheltered in the home of a generous Maecenas, Count Sylva Taroucca, found /iv/ permanent asylum in a villa previously occupied by the Kinsky family.

In 1890, Mr. Niederle was named professor of ethnology and prehistory at the Czech University. No one was better qualified than he to occupy this chair.

In the year 1889 he began to publish certain anthropological essays in the Czech language. In 1894 he brought out in the same language a volume on Prehistoric Man, Especially in the Slavic Countries, which has been translated into Russian and into Polish. Then he undertook a vast work designed to replace Šafarik's *Slavic Antiquities* and bearing the same title. Two volumes of this work were published between 1902 and 1910. In addition, Mr. Niederle devoted a considerable number of monographs to the Slovaks. Finally, he summarized his total research on the Slavic peoples in the volume which we are here presenting in translation. This volume is merely the expansion of an article which appearing a short while ago in the Czech Encyclopedia published at Prague by the Otto Publishing Company.

II.

161

Before the nineteenth century scarcely any serious attention was paid to statistics dealing with the Slavic peoples. In 1826, Šafarik

1: Niederle--5 E-5 1911 1/16 Slavic Peoples E/C

Bulgaria EE I
Serbia EFL

time to determine the facts and here are the terms in which Mr. Florinskii worded his decision in 1908:

"It seems to me," he said, "that there is no valid reason at all for making the Macedonians a special ethnographic group. The principal criterion is deciding upon the division of this group between the Bulgarian and Serbian nationalities is established by the linguistic data. According to these, insofar as they are known at present--it has been determined that the majority of the Macedonian dialects have the fundamental characteristics of the Bulgarian language. It is only in northern Macedonia, in the districts of Skoplje, Tetovo, and Kratovo that the peculiarities of the Serbian language appear clearly in the Slavic idioms, through they are with certain peculiarities of the Balkan tongue."

Mr. Florinskii concludes by awarding the north /ix/ of Macedonia to the Serbs, and the remainder to the Bulgars.

"I do not know," I wrote in 1908, in connection with the publication of Mr. Florinskii's book (1), "if this judgment of Solomon

1. In *l'Energie francaise*, issue of 29 February, 1907, will satisfy the two parties. In any case one may be certain that the Greeks will make fierce outcry. Be that as it may, I cannot urge the Serbs and the Bulgars too strongly to find a definitive *modus vivendi*. The Slavs could not possibly make too many concessions in order to unite themselves against the eternal enemies of their race: the Germans, the Magyars, the Greeks, the Turks."

In those matters which relate to the Slavs of Macedonia, Mr. Niederle has arrived at almost the same conclusions as Mr. Florinskii; but he has supported them by other arguments.

III.

In writing the article "Slavs" for the Czech Encyclopedia, Mr. Niederle found it necessary to study certain problems of demography and anthropology. At that precise moment the Academy of Sciences of Saint Petersburg proposed the publication of an Encyclopedia of Slavic Philology under the direction of Mr. V. Jagic (1), the eminent /x/

1. See my article about Monsieur Jagic in the *Journal des Savants*, (Year 1908).

professor at the University of Vienna. Probably at the instigation of this distinguished scholar, they requested Mr. Niederle to write for this collection a volume upon the Slavic race. This volume written

2 [Mr. Florinskii, professor in the University of Kiev, 1903--English]

114 in the Russian language and accompanied by a very fine map appeared in Saint Petersburg in 1909. But an academic edition is always an official publication. One cannot say everything; one is restricted by certain considerations of diplomacy.

Thus, shortly after this edition appeared, Mr. Niederle brought out another one in Prague in his mother tongue, Czech, and it is upon this text that my translation is based. It has benefited from certain corrections and additions, which the author was kind enough to give me. My version is as exact as possible; nevertheless I must warn the reader that I have occasionally suppressed certain names of localities which are not found on our French maps, abbreviated certain nomenclatures which appeared too long, and simplified the bibliography.

IV

000 Mr. Niederle's book is appearing just at the moment when the problems raised by the Slavic race /xi/ has become more than ever. These problems above all required illumination by the clear light of statistics. If, for example, we in France have been guilty of so many serious errors, which have been so harmful to us, in relation to Poland, this was caused by our ignorance of the exact relation between the number of Poles and the total number of their adversaries. On April 20, 1840, Cousin, the Minister of Public Instruction, explained to the Chamber of Deputies the basic reasons underlying the request for the establishment of a chair of Slavic language and literature at the Collège de France. This document naively stated that the most widely spoken of all of the Slavic dialects was the Polish-~~which~~ evidently meant that the Poles were more numerous than the Russians. If we had been aware of the true numerical relationship between these two nations, we would perhaps have spared the Poles and ourselves cruel trials and bitter disillusionments. The same report reduced to two million the number of Slavs in Turkey and this reduction rendered absolutely incomprehensible to our legislators and to our publicists the problems which were agitating the Balkan Peninsula. I have spoken elsewhere of the absurdities that have been gathered together in certain works by Polish refugees, which some publicists, /xii/ such as Saint-Marc Girardin, readily took seriously (1), and of the fantasies of which

1. See *Souvenirs d'un slavophile*, passim. The work which Saint-Marc Girardin stated to be serious, judicious, exact, was entitled *Recherches historiques et statistiques sur les peuples d'origine slave, magyare et roumaine*. (Paris, 1852) The

2 [Original Czech version translated into French by Louis Leger-Bachel]

000

author was named Kubalski.

Henri Martin and others were guilty in the matter of the pretended Turanianism of the Russians. In pointing out these fantasies or these errors I naturally have made some enemies among those who believe that it is to their advantage to exploit them. But truth must be served above all else.

It is to serve once again the cause of truth--and at the same time the interests of our country--that I have undertaken this translation. In it will be found in a flawless and rigorously scientific style everything which concerns the distribution of the Slavic nations, the statistics, the demography, the anthropology of this poorly known group. It is to be hoped that this work may become the breviary of our professors, of our publicists, of our politicians. We have been led astray sufficiently in the matter of the Slavic peoples; the time has come for us to form a just and exact idea of them.

LOUIS LEGER.

/1/

THE SLAV RACE

INTRODUCTION

114

Editor's Note: Names which did not occur in the English reference books available to me, occur in a form transliterated from Russian and are marked with an asterisk.

109

S1.--The first Slavs appeared only recently in Central Europe, where little by little they came to be distinguished from the other Indo-European peoples because of the difference in their language and partially because of the differences in their civilization. From the outset they differed among themselves from the point of view of their physical characteristics; they presented diverse types as to the shape of the skull and the skull and the color of hair and eyes. In the regions in which the primitive Slavs evidently have dwelt since the most remote times, we encounter from the prehistoric period differing types of skulls and different colorations.

142

At the moment of their entrance upon the historic scene, a portion of the Slavs are represented to us as men with light-colored eyes and blond or red hair, others with dark hair; the vestiges of hair found in tombs confirm these two types.

174 the Elbe, the Saale, and the Sumava (Boehmerwald) and has produced
 101 the Slavic branches of the Polabians, Pomorians, Poles, and Czechoslovaks; the second, whose primitive home was between the upper Vistula, the Dnestr, and the middle Danube, descended little by little--save a few tribes to the south of the Carpathians,--some to establish themselves on the Drava, others, after having crossed the Sava and the Danube, in the region of the/4/ Balkans, and formed the Slovene, Serbo-Croatian, and Bulgar groups; the third group spread out from the basin of the Dnepr in a vast circle to the north as far as the Gulf of Finland, on the upper Dnepr, the Volga, the Oka, to the east, towards the Don, to the south, towards the Black Sea and the lower Danube, and formed the Russian nation; under the influence of diverse conditions this nation differentiated within itself and became altered according to the localities in which it had settled.

101 The various branches of the Slav family are not all equally differentiated from each other. Between the Czechs and the Poles the difference is greater than between the Czechs and the Slovaks. It is greater between the Great Russians and the Poles than between the Great Russians and the Ukrainians. Furthermore, in politics and in literature controversies continuously arise in the matter of knowing whether a segment should be considered as a tribe or as an independent nation. There is no agreement at all as to the use of the terms nation, nationality, tribe, branch, any more than as to the actual total number of Slavs.

900 It all depends upon the points of view on the matter of philology, ethnography, history, and or politics. Even when one starts out from the same viewpoint, one can arrive at various conclusions. One philologist sees two languages where another one sees only dialects of the same tongue. Certain of them give greater weight to their hopes for a renaissance, for political individuality, /5/ for national autonomy, than to the scientific data; others, obedient to political considerations, imagine new nations which their rivals are even unwilling to hear mentioned. Thus the number of Slavic nations, and, consequently, the method of handling the entire Slavic problem, differs greatly from one author to another. Thus Dobrowsky (1),--

114 1. Joseph Dobrowsky, born in 1753, died in 1829, a Czech scholar, the true creator of Slavic philology. See my note about him in the Grande Encyclopedie, Translator.

in order not to go too far back, nor to become involved in too many

- 114 details, --recognized in 1822 nine living languages and nine nations (Russian, Illyrian or Serb, Croat, Slovene, Korutanian (2), Slovak, 2. Korutanians, a name given by certain ethnographers to the Slavs of Carniola (In Latin Carantania). Translator. Czech, Lusatian, Polish); Safarik (3) in his *Slavic Ethnography* in 1842, 3. About Safarik, see the notice in the *Journal des Savants* (March-April 1910) Translator.
- six languages with thirteen dialects (Russian, Bulgarian, Illyrian, Lekho-Polish, Czech, Lusatian); J. Sreznev ii (4) in 1843, nine 4. A Russian philologist of the 19th century. Translator. languages: Great Russian, Ukrainian, Bulgarian, Serbo-Croatian, Koroutanian Polish, Lusatian, Czech, Slovak; August Schleicher in 1865, eight languages: Polish, Lusatian, Czech, Great Russian, Ukrainian, Slovene, Serbian, Bulgarian; Fr. Miklosich, nine languages (Slovene, Bulgarian, Serbo-Croatian, Ukrainian, /6/ Great Russian, Czech, Polish, Upper Lusatian, Lower Lusatian); Dm. Florinskii in 1907, nine languages (Russian, Bulgarian, Serbo-Croatian, Slovene, Czech-Moravian, Slovak, Lusatian, Kashubian); V. Jagic in 1898, eight languages (Polish, Lusatian, Czech, Great Russian, Ukrainian, Slovene, Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian). But, if today we were to follow certain publicists and the numerous separatist tendencies, the number of Slavic languages would mount up to between eleven and fourteen without counting those which are dead.

000 S. 2. --We do not intend to become involved in these controversies, which are most frequently inspired by reasons unconnected 128 with science. But, since it is essential to establish a frame of reference, a general plan, at the outset of an ethnographic study we are going to proceed in accordance with the following one, without attempting to find fault with others. Here is the order in which we are going to study the Slavic ethnography:

1. The Russian group, in which one is today strongly inclined to distinguish two nations: the Great Russians and the Little Russians (South Russians, Ukrainians, Rousines or Ruthenians).
2. The Polish group in its entirety, one should mention here the Kashubs, whom certain people consider as Poles, while others, as the last remnants of Baltic Slavs who have disappeared.
3. The group of Lusatian Sorbs, divided into two /7/ quite distinct branches: the Upper Lusatians and the Lower Lusatians.
4. The Czech group which forms a compact unit in Bohemia and Moravia, but from which the Slovaks of Hungary are detaching themselves

Slavic Civilization

101 For many years the Slavs lived beside the Danube, where
 174 the Hungarian and the Bulgarian lands now lie. From among
 167 these Slavs parties scattered throughout the country and were
 known by appropriate names, according to the places where
 they settled. Thus some came and settled by the river Morava,
 and were named Moravians, while others were called Czechs.
 Among these same Slavs are included the White Croats, the
 Serbs, and the Carinthians. For when the Vlakhs attacked the
 Danubian Slavs, and settled among them, the latter came and
 made their homes by the Vistula, and were then called Lyakhs.
 Of these Lyakhs some were called Polyanians, some Lutichians,
 some Mazovians, and still others Pomorians. Certain Slavs also
 settled on the Dnieper, and were called Polyanians. Still others
 were called Derevlians, because they lived in the forests. Some
 also settled between the Pripet and the Dvina, and were known
 as Dregovichians. Other tribes settled on the Dvina and be-
 came known as Polotians, from a small stream named the Polot,
 which flows into the Dvina. . . . The Slavs also settled around
 lake Ilmen, and were there known by their own name. They
 built a city, and called it Novgorod. Still others had their settle-
 ments along the Desna, the Sem, and the Sula, and were called
 Severians. And thus the Slavic race was scattered, and likewise
 its language was known as Slavic.

174 In this passage, apart from the detail expended by the author
 167 on particularizing the various Eastern Slavic tribes which had
 114 fallen under the sway of Kiev more than two centuries before
 he wrote, what is most striking is his implication that neither
 the Western Slavs (Czechs, Moravians, and Poles) nor the
 Eastern Slavs were, in the annalist's view, indigenous to the
 areas they occupied in his day. He accepts the tradition that
 the original home of the Slavs was on the middle Danube, from
 which region (as he relates) they were displaced at an earlier
 undefined period by a nation known as the Vlakhs, under
 whose pressure they sought safer residences to the north and
 northeast. Now, while the term Vlach has various meanings,

The Primitive Slavs

5

it would be most natural here to attach it to the Celtic Gauls 174
 who penetrated the Danube basin early in the fourth century 167
 B.C. and then, under the leadership of a chief named Brennus, 114
 marched down through Thrace and Macedonia and invaded
 Greece as far as Delphi in 280. The only difficulty lies in the
 absence of the slightest indication in Greek or Latin historians
 and geographers that the Slavs, or any part of them, were present
 on the middle or lower Danube basin before the Christian
 era. Nor are there in this area any early place names demonstrably
 Slavic which would show these sources to be faulty in
 this respect.

In fact, though the evidence of this passage from the Russian 174
 annals led numerous medieval and early modern historians in 114
 the last century to accept the Danubian origin of the Slavs,
 other much more reliable and older sources place them further
 north beyond the Carpathian Mountains when they make their
 first appearance in history. To be sure, the Slavs do not begin
 their historical career under this name, but under another [101]
 which is etymologically related to the English term "Wends"
 or the German "Wenden," frequently applied to the Slavs in
 our own day. As the Venedi, Veneti, or Venedae, they are thus
 mentioned by Pliny the Elder and by Tacitus during the first
 century, and by the Egyptian astronomer and geographer
 Claudius Ptolemy, who wrote in Greek toward the end of the
 second century. Pliny locates them vaguely in the vicinity of
 the Vistula. Tacitus is equally indefinite, placing them in the
 unknown country east of the Suebic confederacy, which he
 knew as Germanic. Ptolemy mentions them as one of the major
 nations living along the Venedic Gulf, which appears to be his
 term for the section of the Baltic coast northeast of the Vistula.

The identity of the Venedae of the Baltic with the Slavs is
 established in the sixth century by Jordanes, the historian of
 the Goths, who says of them in one passage: "From the source
 of the Vistula river immense areas are occupied by the populous
 nation of the Venethae, who, though their appellations
 may change in various clans and districts, are mainly called

174 *Sclaveni* and *Antae*," and adds elsewhere, "Though deriving from one stem, they have now adopted three names, that is, Venethi, Antes, and *Sclaveni*." The "Ravenna Cosmographer," an anonymous geographic work not later than the seventh century, mentions the *Sclavini* as living in Scythia, which is here a generic term for northeastern Europe, while the ninth-century Latin text known as the "Anonymous Bavarus," with the full title "Description of the cities and regions on the north bank of the Danube," speaks of the *Zeruiani* (the name is obviously related to the modern terms *Serb* and *Sorb*), "which is so great a realm that from it, as their tradition relates, all the tribes of the Slavs are sprung and trace their origin."

Such of these sources as belong to the sixth century or later obviously reflect a period when the Slavic dispersion had already begun, but they are interesting as early datable appearances of the name *Slav* and as a sound basis for identifying Wends and Slavs as the same people.

174 Linguistic evidence also impels us to place the Slavs north of the Carpathians before their dispersion. Old Slavonic not only shows traces of contacts with Thracian, Iranian, and Germanic, but is also closely related to Lithuanian and exerted some influence on the early Finnish vocabulary. The only area where such extensive relations could have developed must necessarily have been north and east of the Carpathian chain. It is likewise true that such anthropological evidence as we have identifies the proto-Slavs rather with the northern long-headed race than with the primitive Central European brachycephalics, though even at the epoch of Slavic unity the cephalic index was by no means uniform, and with the lapse of time the stronger shortheaded brunette type came to dominate among the Slavs, as it does indeed today.

174 The topological nomenclature of the Carpathian range is, moreover, not Slavic, thus indicating that the early Slavs lived beyond these mountains and the forests which clothed them. Furthermore, Herodotus mentions as adjacent and subject to

The Primitive Slavs

7

the Scythians, but as distinct from them, a tribe known as the Neuri, who lived between the upper Dniester and the middle Dnieper rivers, and certain related Slavic place names indicate that they extended to the basins of the western Bug and the Vistula. This tribe is therefore generally regarded as Slavic, and on this basis it may be held with some certainty that the proto-Slavs as early as the fifth century B.C., and thus long before their dispersion, inhabited an area at least as far to the east as modern Kiev. 174

To the west it is not possible to place the proto-Slavic boundary beyond the Vistula, since all ancient historians mention this river as the eastern boundary of Germanic settlement. A further indication of this western Slavic frontier is the fact that the vocabulary of the proto-Slavs lacked a word for the beechtree, which grows west of a line roughly connecting Königsberg and Odessa, so that the Slavs were forced to borrow this name from their early Germanic neighbors. There is no good archaeological evidence to indicate that the proto-Slavs ever extended as far as the Elbe, though their medieval descendants reached it. Neither did they touch the Baltic, for the area north of the string of lakes and marshes which separates modern East Prussia from Polish territory was inhabited at the beginning of the Christian era by Baltic tribes akin to the present-day Lithuanians, who likewise occupied the basins of the Memel and the Dvina between the Slavs and the Gulf of Riga. Before the Christian era, the proto-Slavs were also separated from the Black Sea by a succession of Iranian tribes who occupied the southern steppe or prairie country, but they must have touched the navigable portions of the Russian rivers west of the Crimea, since Old Slavonic borrowed the Greek word for boat. 174

The habitat of the primitive Slavs before their dispersion was thus an irregular oblong area northeast of the Carpathians, extending eastward from the basin of the middle Vistula to the course of the Dnieper north and south of Kiev, bounded on the 131